

The Task Force on Court Facilities

455 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94102-3660

FINANCE AND IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE

Meeting Report

December 9, 1999 Doubletree Hotel Orange County

TASK FORCE ATTENDEES: PRESENTERS:

Hon. Daniel Kremer Dr. Thomas Gardner, VITETTA

COMMITTEE MEMBERS: TASK FORCE STAFF:

PRESENT: Mr. Bob Lloyd, Facilities Planner

Mr. David Janssen, Chair Ms. Patricia Bonderud, Facilities Planner

Mr. Greg Abel
Hon. Diane Wick

CONSULTANTS TO THE TASK FORCE:

Hon. Charles Smith

Dr. Thomas Gardner, VITETTA

Ms. Kit Cole, VITETTA

ABSENT: Mr. Jay Smith, DMJM
Hon. Jerry Eaves

Mr. Fred Klass GUESTS:

The Committee agenda included:

- 1. Discussing three key questions:
 - What are the general issues regarding ownership can a state or local system best meet the needs for the future?
 - What are some of the pros and cons associated with state versus local responsibility?
 - What are some characteristics the Committee has identified that could serve as a starting place for the new system?
- 2. Determining optimal responsibility plan
- 3. Approving meeting schedule for 2000
- 4. Directing VITETTA to draft facilities management proposal for March 2000 meeting

Agenda Item #1

The Committee briefly reviewed and discussed question #1 and identified two key issues:

- 1. The importance of having organizational responsibility for fiscal issues and administrative/operational issues housed in the same agency/department/entity.
- 2. The importance of the court as a separate branch of government with control/responsibility for its functions, staff and facilities.

The Committee focused the majority of the meeting time on discussing the pros and cons of state versus local ownership/responsibility for the courts listed under Question #2 in the handout, especially identifying those issues that may be particularly controversial.

The Committee approached these issues, listed below, to determine if any were unmanageable or so severe as not to allow for a transition away from current roles. The following issues were seen as critical but all were deemed manageable:

- Preservation of historical sites
- County role in siting new projects
- Transition of projects in the construction "pipeline"

The Committee had consensus on the following issues:

- A state-based model is the optimal choice in order to ensure that fiscal and administrative responsibility are co-located
- Revenues should transfer with debt when debt is transferred to the state
- The transfer of responsibility to the state should be "revenue neutral" for both the state and counties
- Responsibility for maintenance should be transferred to the state in the same way as funding for operations has been transferred

Issues that are still outstanding and need to be resolved at future Committee meetings include:

- Mixed tenant buildings
- Land ownership
- Buildings that are in the construction pipeline
- Transfer of responsibility for existing buildings
- Responsibility for bringing inadequate courts up to "standard"

Agenda Item #2 – Responsibility plan

The Committee discussed the characteristics of a future trial court facilities statewide system, with the Committee focusing on tasks associated with new and future capital outlay, including the following processes: capital request, selection of projects, design standards, location and siting, construction, ownership and maintenance.

Agenda Item #3 – Meeting schedule for 2000

The Committee reviewed the meeting schedule but did not formally approve it.

Agenda Item #4 – Consultants' responsibilities

The Committee directed VITETTA and DMJM to mail out the finance survey by Friday, December 17th. The cover letter will go out under David Janssen's signature. The surveys will be due back February 15th, 2000. David will make a presentation to the CAOs at the CSAC CAOs meeting on December 19th.

The Committee also directed VITETTA to mail out to Committee members, no later than January 14, a draft responsibility plan for their review prior to the January 20 meeting.

Next meeting

Next Committee meeting will be in Sacramento on January 20, 2000 from 1:30 to 3:30 p.m.